



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. DOX 1450 - Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

| APPLICATION NO. | F | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |
|---|----------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| 10/015,616 | , | 12/17/2001 | Yuji Tochio | 1344.1080 | ,7298 |
| 21171 | 7590 | 09/22/2003 | | | |
| STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. | | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | | RODRIGUEZ, ARMANDO | |
| WASHING | WASHINGTON, DC 20005 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| • | | | | 2828 . | |
| | | | | DATE MAILED: 09/22/2003 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | No. Applicant(s) | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 10/015,616 | TOCHIO, YUJI | | | | | |
| Advisory Action | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | |
| | Armando Rodriguez | 2828 | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address | | | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 21 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to ave final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | oid abandonment of this applicated abandonment of this applicated and abandonent which | ation. A proper reply to a | | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR RE | EPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mail | g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or | | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF | Brief must be filed within the per R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o | eriod set forth in f the appeal. | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be | ecause: | | | | | | |
| (a) they raise new issues that would require further | er consideration and/or search (| see NOTE below); | | | | | |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b | pelow); | | | | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or | n better form for appeal by mate | rially reducing or simplifying the | | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceli NOTE: | ng a corresponding number of f | inally rejected claims. | | | | | |
| Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject | ion(s)· | | | | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | • | eparate, timely filed amendment | | | | | |
| 5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: Se | | dered but does NOT place the | | | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | ause it is not directed SOLELY t | o issues which were newly | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we | | | | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | | |
| 8. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on is | a) approved or b) disapp | roved by the Examiner. | | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen | nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | | | | | | |
| 10. Other: | | Paulos | | | | | |
| | | Paul Ip Supervisor Art Unit 2828 | | | | | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 04-01) Ans

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the Kolodzey (PN4 4,339,822) cited reference does disclose and illustrates in figure 1, a circuit, which provides the laser (16) with a pre-bias current, a biased current by means (12) and a modulation current, which establishes the pulse. It is well-known in the art to pre-biase a laser, see column 3 and it is common knowledge to apply the pre-biasing prior to the data signal. It is also well-known to apply a biasing current in accordance to the desired output power, see column 3. Thereby, column 3 and the background of the Kolodzey reference clearly disclose the use of pre-biasing current, biasing current and modualtion curent of a laser diode, as recited in claim 14.